

REMARKS

I. NEW CLAIMS 35-45

The above amendment adds new claims 35-45. Claims 35-45 are directed to the non-stick coating formulations that can be used to create the coatings of claims 1-14.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-14 were rejected as being indefinite because they are directed to a coating but the claims do not positively recite a substrate on which the coating is applied. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are indefinite. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicant has added the phrase – on a substrate – to the preamble of claim 1. The substrate is not part of the claimed invention. Rather, the substrate is mentioned in the preamble solely as a reference point for the claimed coating.

The Examiner also rejected claims 4, 5, 11, and 12 as indefinite because it is not clear what material the abbreviation "PFA" is intended to designate. Applicant has amended the specification to clarify that PFA means a copolymer of tetrafluoroethylene and perfluoro (propyl vinyl ether).

III. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 6, 8, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Okuda et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,183,869). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 1 and 8 (from which claims 6 and 13 depend) require that the coating include at least one coat that comprises the required components. Okuda does not teach one coat that comprises the required components. Rather, Okuda teaches "a two-part primer composition composed of a first solution containing as a main component a

silane coupling agent and a second solution containing a flouroresin and heat resistant resin." (Okuda, col. 6, lines 31-35). Example 1 of Okuda describes how this "two-part primer composition" is applied to a substrate (Okuda, col. 22, line 50 – col. 23, line 2). The first solution (the solution that contains a silane coupling agent) is applied to the substrate, heated, and dried (Okuda, col. 22, lines 50-57). The second solution containing the remaining ingredients is not applied until after the silane-containing first solution is dried (Okuda, col. 22, lines 58-65). Accordingly, the "primer layer" of Okuda that is referenced in the Office Action is actually two coats. Because Okuda does not teach that the required components are present in one coat, it does not teach the invention of claims 1-14. Applicant therefore requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6-8, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuda. Claims 2-5 and 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Okuda in view of Gebauer (U.S. Pat. No. 4,546,141). As discussed above, Okuda does not disclose, teach, or suggest a coating wherein the required components are present in one coat. For this reason, the invention of claims 1 and 8, and the claims that depend therefrom, are not obvious in view of Okuda or Okuda in combination with Gebauer. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1-14 and 35-45 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is therefore requested. If there are any questions concerning this Response, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4720.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark H. Remus
Registration No. 40,141

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4200

January 14, 2005